

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Fatent and Trademark Office Address: O. Dox, 1459 P. Dox, 1459 Alexandris, Virginia 22313-1459 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/931,415 08/17/2001		Debabrata Ghosh	45283.2	3885		
	590 12/16/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER		
EDWARD YOO C/O BENNETT JONES 1000 ATCO CENTRE			VO, 1	VO, HAI		
10035 - 105 S'	TREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
EDMONTON,	ALBERTA, AB T5J	3T2	1771	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	6				• •				
		Appli	cation No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/93	31,415	GHOSH ET AL.	\bigcirc				
		Exam	iner	Art Unit					
		Hai V		1771					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN missions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty of period for reply is specified above, the maximum re to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three months ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In r munication. 30) days, a reply within the tatutory period will apply a y will, by statute cause the	no event, however, may a restatutory minimum of third	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely THS from the mailing date of this of	y. ommunication.				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <u>14 Novemb</u> e	er 2003.						
2a)[☐	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action i	s non-final.						
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>27-36</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>27-33 and 36</u> is/are rejected claim(s) <u>34 and 35</u> is/are objected claim(s) are subject to restri	are withdrawn from ed.							
Applicati	on Papers								
	The specification is objected to by th								
10)[10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11)[7]	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	b by the Examiner.	Note the attached	Office Action or form PT	O-152.				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign mainable		440(-) (1) (0)					
a)L * S 13)∐ A sii 37	All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internatic et the attached detailed Office action cknowledgment is made of a claim force a specific reference was included the CFR 1.78. The translation of the foreign lar	documents have be documents have be of the priority document Bureau (PCT In for a list of the coor domestic priority din the first senter	peen received. peen received in Appens have been received in Appens have been received and recei	oplication No received in this National Seceived. \$ 119(e) (to a provisional tion or in an Application I	application)				
14)∐ A	cknowledgment is made of a claim f	or domestic priority	under 35 U.S.C. 8	§ 120 and/or 121 since a	a specific				
re	ference was included in the first sen	tence of the specif	ication or in an App	olication Data Sheet. 37 C	FR 1.78.				
Attachment	· •								
2) 🔲 Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) P	TO-948) aper No(s)		immary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-					

Application/Control Number: 09/931,415

Art Unit: 1771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants argue that since the seals of the present invention function only as a physical barrier, it is apparent that no catalytic element is contemplated as part of the sealing function. The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. The limitations "the seal does not comprise a catalytic element" are not found support in Applicants' specification. Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. See *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), aff'd mem., 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1771

4. Claims 27-32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Sago (US 4.650,621). Sago teaches a heat exchange element comprising a matrix of ceramic fibers wherein the interstices among the ceramic fibers are uniformly filled with a ceramic particles (abstract, column 6, lines 5-10). The ceramic particles are interspersed between the ceramic fibers (column 3, lines 57-60). The fibers and particles are unsintered (column 6, lines 11-20). There is no suggestion or disclosure of the precise orientation of the ceramic fibers in the matrix, therefore the ceramic fibers are randomly oriented. The ceramic fibers are silica fibers, alumina fibers, zirconia fibers (column 2, lines 44-45). The ceramic particles are silica particles or alumina powders (column 5, lines 43-50, column 6, line 8). The heat exchange element is used after subjecting it to further processing such as re-adhesion in order to obtain the shape, dimension and construction necessary for suitable heat exchange element (column 6, lines 22-25). Likewise, it is clearly apparent that the heat exchange element is subjected to compression for re-adhesion. The heat exchange is thus compressible. Sago is using a corrugating machine to produce any shape desirable for the heat exchange element (column 5, lines 25-35). Likewise, it is apparent that the heat exchange element is flexible too! The fibers and particles are not sintered (column 6, lines 11-20). Nothing in Sago discloses or suggests that the heat exchange element is hermetically gas tight. It is the examiner's position that Sago anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 09/931.415

Art Unit: 1771

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 4

6. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sago (US 4,650,621) as evidenced by Sanocki et al (US 5,955,177). Sago discloses the solid particles having a particle size less than 5.5 microns to increase hydroscopic capability and durability (column 3, line 61 to column 4, lines 1-14). However, Sago does not specifically disclose the functional lower limit for particle size, i.e., less than 1 micron. Therefore, it is necessary and thus obvious for the skilled artisan to look to the prior art for a suitable lower limit to particle size for the solid particles. Sanoki teaches a flexible mat for use in heat exchanger comprising a matrix of ceramic fibers and a plurality of solid particles interspersed between the ceramic fibers (abstract, column 10, line 24). Sanoki is relied on as evidence that teaches the solid particles having a particle size between 1 nm to 1 micron (column 9, line 1), meeting the range set out in the claims. The teaching of Sanoki would give the skilled artisans the tools necessary to conclude that it is desirable to use the solid particles with a particle size less than 1micron in the heat exchanger element. In the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the solid particles having a substantial particle size within the range instantly claimed, motivated by desire to increase hydroscopic capability and durability.

Application/Control Number: 09/931,415

Art Unit: 1771

Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-33, and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- The art rejections over Sanocki and Numamoto have been overcome by the present amendment and response (see pages 3 and 4 of the amendment filed on 08/28/2003).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 34 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The inclusion of the solid particles with the particle size less than about 1 micron comprising a first portion and a second portion wherein the average particle size of the first portion is larger than the average particle size of the second portion renders the claims unobvious over the prior art. Graphs A and B of Sago shown in figure 3 illustrate that there are no two groups of the particles with size less than 1 micron.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (703) 605-4426. The examiner can normally be reached on M,T,Th, F, 8:30-6:00 and on alternating Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax

Application/Control Number: 09/931,415

Art Unit: 1771

Page 6

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

HV

Hai V6 AU 1771